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Creating Strategic Partnerships
Looking to gain insight into the fundamental question of how to create strategic partnerships, in this issue we host a range of institutions with collaborations exemplary of the concept, from different industrial sectors, higher education institutions, and those with collaborations forged through initiatives by the national governments and European funding programs. Moreover, we have given the floor to experts who share their opinions based on years of experience and knowledge on the topic.

What these stories tell us is that it is almost always people and personal relationships that form the basis of interactions. It was “getting out of the lab”, “starting talking to each other”, “honest communication”, and “developing a joint collaboration culture” what kept the wheels turning, as many of our authors have mentioned. While not being the only criteria that strategic partnerships are built on, we can conclude that relationships were the antidote of potential challenges to be tackled on the way. Then comes the right physical and framework structures, national and supranational funding programs, and systematised approaches that consolidated the partnerships, helping them grow to be stronger in their reach and impact. Sometimes it is an entrepreneurship competition event, a PhD research track, a joint curriculum, or a space like a science park that bring stakeholders together with the same vision to develop sustainable partnerships. Which means, there is no single way, constellation or formula that leads strategic collaborations to occur.

We hope you find our collection of articles inspirational as much as informative in their unique ways of establishing and developing partnerships.

Hacer Tercanli
Managing Editor
Successful Health Innovation Partnership Based on Unique Model of Collaboration

How do you create synergy in a health innovation partnership involving three universities, a university college and two public health institutions? Copenhagen Health Innovation has striven to answer this question since 2016, and experience shows that local rooting is necessary if the broad collaboration is to succeed.

Increased life expectancy and more patients with chronic and multiple diseases are solid challenges facing the healthcare sector in the years to come. The technological and medical development increases the demand for more, better and more effective healthcare services. If we are to prepare future health professionals for a constantly changing healthcare sector, we must put together coherent and progressive study programmes that provide the students with innovation competences and experience with translating professional knowledge into new ideas and solutions based on real-life social challenges.

We Must Create a Closer Connection between Education and Practice

This goal was the reason why four large Copenhagen-based educational institutions and two of the main healthcare providers in Denmark in 2016 decided to work together on finding a new approach to equip students with the competences needed in the future. The six organisations established a strategic partnership, Copenhagen Health Innovation (CHI), as a unifying organisation facilitating closer collaboration between management, teachers, students and health professionals as partners.

One of CHI’s main focuses is to create a closer connection between healthcare practice and study programmes. This is done by identifying health challenges from practice in the City of Copenhagen and the Capital Region of Denmark and integrating these into the teaching of both health professional, technological and business-oriented study programmes. Working with concrete challenges from the healthcare sector gives the students a chance to test their professional knowledge on real-life problems and to develop an open and innovative mindset preparing them for the dynamic demand for competences of the future labour market.

Local Rooting Facilitates Internal Value Creation

In order to support this effort and to develop a joint collaboration culture, a special working group was established, in addition to the independent central organisation, and tasked with developing and running the initiative. The group includes one dedicated member of staff from each of the six partner organisations. These innovation consultants are funded by the joint scheme.
but employed by the individual partners. They meet regularly for development meetings, their shared goal being to integrate health challenges into teaching. The balance between local rooting and joint strategic development creates certain benefits in the work of the consultants and their approach to the task.

‘Local rooting is important to the educational institutions. In order for the project to succeed, we need to establish good connections with teachers. It is not just a question of connecting things. Facilitating collaboration with practice requires an understanding of the reality facing the teachers and the courses,’ says Werner Sperchneider and Nina Riis, innovation consultants at University College Copenhagen and the University of Copenhagen, respectively. They both help teachers implement challenges and adjust their teaching in order for it to support the innovation process the students undergo in the attempt to find ideas and solutions to a given challenge and to make sure that it prepares the students for working with practice.

**IN ORDER FOR THE PROJECT TO SUCCEED, WE NEED TO ESTABLISH GOOD CONNECTIONS WITH TEACHERS, FACILITATING COLLABORATION WITH PRACTICE REQUIRES UNDERSTANDING OF THE REALITY FACING THE TEACHERS AND THE COURSES**

Rooting is just as important in the Capital Region of Denmark, which is responsible for the public hospitals.

‘There is no doubt that it would have been more difficult for me to contact the hospital departments if I had not been employed by the Capital Region. You must know the value of both output and collaboration and respect and understand the everyday life and core tasks of the health professionals before you can establish a successful collaboration with clinical practice,’ says Nina Brocks from the Capital Region of Denmark.

**Unique Approach to Health Innovation**

Nina Brocks complex challenges and, together with the other consultants, makes sure that they are implemented in relevant study programmes so both the unit behind the challenge, the teacher and the students get the most out of the collaboration.

‘This approach to working with health innovation is unique, and it is important to make sure that the different collaborators understand the opportunities and limitations – from what it requires to collaborate with the healthcare sector to what can realistically be expected of the students,’ Nina Brocks stresses.

For example, the developers of a new children’s hospital in Copenhagen, BørneRiget, needed new ideas for the design of the future children’s hospital. This challenge was matched with a strategy and design course at the Technical University of Denmark. The students spent an entire day at existing children’s wards collecting empirical data. Subsequently they developed design concepts, which had to focus on the value of the idea for the child, its parents and the organisation as a whole. BerneRiget received many ideas with inspiration for their future development, and the students gained unique experience developing something that had to fit into a complex organisation.

This match was possible only because the innovation consultants are deeply rooted in their organisations and have the overview necessary to match the right parties.

**Balance Reaching Joint Goals**

Just because local rooting is a prerequisite for establishing a joint development initiative does not mean that it is easy. The individual partner organisations interpret the cross-sectorial collaboration differently, and this created problems during the start-up phase, as the group members had very different expectations, focuses and interests.

‘Especially during the start-up phase we had very different focuses with regard to the outputs of the project. Practice has a natural focus on solving health challenges, while the educational partners focus more on educational goals and study programmes. This has made it difficult to work in the same direction on a shared goal,’ says Nina Brocks from the Capital Region of Denmark.

However, it is obvious that this kind of collaboration and cultural understanding across sectors takes time and dialogue. Here the innovation consultants play a main role in facilitating collaboration between teachers and health professionals, creating good matches and ensuring that the given health challenge is adjusted to the teaching. In other words, it is important to ensure equality in the group of consultants and to coordinate the resource consumption, as this creates a basis for long-term collaborations of value to all parties.

**Culture Development through Co-Creation from Various Starting Points**

The challenges experienced during the start-up phase were expected, and gradually the innovation consultants have gotten to know each other and the organisations. In this way, Copenhagen Health Innovation is not just a collaboration – it is a culture development project. The six partners are very different and have different perspectives on innovation and on working with innovation. However, the tension field between the partners also reveals the true potential of the collaboration.

When the innovation consultants join the students in practice and see the solutions created, the value of their great efforts becomes visible.

‘It is great to watch the students face practice – when they surprise us by asking questions that we did not expect, or when they challenge practice, and practice loves it. Watching the interplay that emerges when the students and practice really commit to the collaboration is incredibly rewarding,’ says Nina Riis from the University of Copenhagen.

**The Value of the Collaboration**

So far, more than 400 students from the four educational institutions have worked on more than 100 challenges from the healthcare sector. The results are impressive:

University College Copenhagen first used health challenges in a single 10-week cross-disciplinary course. According to the head of studies, this caused a quantum leap in learning and increased commitment among the students. Therefore, the approach has now been expanded to several cross-disciplinary courses offered each semester.

The University of Copenhagen ran an intensive four-day pilot course for 12 students of dentistry, who had to solve a challenge facing care dental treatment in the City of Copenhagen. This process was also such a success that the head of studies expects to repeat the course next year, this time for 200 students.

The healthcare sector also considers the collaboration with the students a success. It has provided them with new perspectives on various challenges, and in some cases it has even been possible to let the students continue to work with their ideas within the scope of a bachelor or master’s thesis project.

The innovation consultants have successfully managed to bridge the gap between the CHI partners and thus to implement a long-term strategic agenda on creating health innovation through education.

ANETTE BIRCK is the Director of Copenhagen Health Innovation and strives to develop the strategic foundation of the partnership as well as to facilitate new networks and new collaborations.
I left school to join the pharmaceutical company, Allen & Hanburys, part of the Glaxo group of companies. I fell on my feet and worked, more by luck than by good judgement, in probably the most successful pharmacology department that has ever existed. In my 20 years in the department, they delivered six life-changing medicines including the first ever billion-dollar p.a. medicine, Zantac. They achieved success through teamwork and collaboration; not only within the department but also across departments.

Following several promotions, I ended up running a research team of a dozen scientists in a neuropharmacology department attempting to find medicines for diseases such as Parkinson’s, depression, schizophrenia and intractable pain. I was publishing the work of the team in scientific journals and presenting at international conferences. I was at that time collaborating with academic scientists in the UK, mainland Europe and the USA. We co-published our research findings and this external work dovetailed with, and underpinned, our internal research. I always considered that this academic collaboration portfolio was generating the additional evidence required to develop a scientific hypothesis in order to give us the confidence to take a molecule through to the expensive late stages of drug development.

As I approached my 40th birthday, I decided on a career change. I loved the vibrancy of the pharmaceutical industry – it was forever changing and evolving; I knew that I was a good researcher but that I was never going to win a Nobel Prize; and I considered alternative roles in pharmaceuticals; roles ranging from government and regulatory affairs through to being a Product Manager. Eventually I left my hectic scientific team of 12 and went from the lab to a quiet Business Development office where I shared a secretary with another BD manager. My new role was to in-license technologies from universities and biotech companies. My relationship with the technology transfer offices of the universities was very different to my relationship with former academic collaborators. It was a very steep learning curve as I was now dealing with legal contracts, patent agents, and financial spreadsheets and continuing to interact with academic scientists but across a much broader range of scientific disciplines. By the end of my 6-month probationary period I was thoroughly enjoying the role.

Over the next couple of years, my role evolved to include negotiations of research collaborations, consortia, studentships and interactions with a range of funders from different countries. There were multiple interfaces between industry and academia that required careful navigation (see Table 1). The primary function of the role was to leverage science and funding to underpin our internal research efforts; and what I had once done to leverage external science for my single research team I was now doing across the broader R&D base.

External science continues to fuel internal research efforts and is so important to my company that the Academic Liaison team has now grown organically to ten people and we negotiate around 700 academic collaborations per annum. Some of these agreements are very small and may involve little or no funding whilst others might be multi-party and multi-million pound collaborations; however, the successful collaborations

Table 1: Multiple Interfaces between Industry & Academia

- Research collaboration with one or more post-doctoral researchers
- Sponsorship of post-graduate studentships
- Academic consultancy
- Provision of biological or chemical materials for research use
- Visiting chair positions for senior industrial scientists
- Academic sabbaticals into industry laboratories
- Sandwich students — undergraduate industrial placements

What Makes a Great Industry-Academia Strategic Partnership?

Malcolm Skingle

Insights from GSK
all have one thing in common – they are all based on mutual respect and trust.

**Ingredients of a Successful Partnership**

All successful industry-academic collaborations have three essential ingredients:

1. A budget – research is expensive and often costs are shared in true collaborations;
2. A programme of research – which clearly defines at the outset what each of the partners are to do during the collaboration;
3. Consenting adults – academic and industrial scientists who respect, and usually like, each other.

There are several criteria that the company consider when selecting collaborative partners and projects. Obviously, the proposed research has to be a close strategic fit to research being undertaken in our own laboratories. Usually the industrial scientist discusses the proposal with an academic to identify areas of common interest. The quality of the proposed science is high and usually is unique. There also needs to be a high likelihood of useful new information or technology arising from the collaboration; and the timing of the scientific outputs need to be such that they can help drive internal research decision-making. From a resource perspective, we would normally expect the external research lab to have the facilities and resources to undertake the work and for the funding package to be competitive.

The continuity of management of an academic collaboration is no different to the management of an internal research programme; the project priorities should be reviewed by the partners on a regular basis to ensure that the project priorities are being met and that the progress and budget are available to complete the work. If the early stage outputs from the project are not positive in driving the science forward then the industrial and academic supervisors of the programme may jointly decide to change the course of the research. This will usually involve an amendment to the legal contract governing the research.

**What does Industry want from Academia?**

GSK have 8,500 scientists working in R&D and they publish their research in high impact journals. However, they generate only a very small percentage of the total science required to bring a new medicine into the clinic. Pharmaceutical companies need access to laterally thinking academics, their know-how and an awareness of developing technologies.

In order to address today’s big scientific challenges you need access to a critical mass of strategic thinking scientists. No single organization, either industrial or academic, is large enough to solve some of the modern day scientific conundrums. A multi-disciplinary approach to problem solving is required and this needs to be coupled with effective project management in order to be successful. As with any partnership, you need to put time and effort into nurturing the relationship. If you get this right then good outcomes are inevitable.

There are multiple benefits from effective academic-industry collaborations (see Table 2) for both parties. For the industrialist, a collaboration will often de-risk research programmes and may allow the company to monitor several competing technologies rather than investing in a technology that is ultimately superseded. For the academic, a good research collaboration affords them access to industrial scale technology and selective ligands that allow them to test their scientific hypotheses. Both partners benefit from the different culture and ways of thinking and working of the other.

Funders of research, both national and international, also benefit from funding industry-academic collaborations. The research councils, medical charities and other science funding organizations all benefit from the rigor of the peer review and due diligence undertaken by the company prior to initiating an academic partnership. The company will ensure that the academic group is globally competitive and will usually work with the academic group to frame the scientific question to be addressed. This gives the external funder confidence in their own peer review process and it also leverages the industrial funding and allows more research to be undertaken. This win-win-win scenario allows indus-

---

**Table 2: The Benefits of Effective Academic Industry Partnerships**

- Access knowledge and new thinking
- Shared risks and rewards
- Harness other sources of funding
- Build global links
- Networking
- Recruitment
- Think longer term
try, the academic and the funder to share the risks and potential rewards of the research undertaken.

The Drive for Impact

Developed countries are acutely aware that a strong science base will drive a knowledge economy and the prosperity of a nation. This drives a nationalistic funding behaviour, which focusses on impact and excellence.

The primary national drivers are to develop a skilled workforce capable of delivering innovations, which ultimately contribute to the prosperity of a nation. In the UK, the research and funding councils operate schemes designed to get academics at least thinking about the potential impact of their publically funded research. The Research Excellence Framework was first introduced by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) in 2014 (REF2014). Impact case studies were assessed on their “reach” and “significance”. GSK were cited in 152 impact case studies in the REF2014 exercise, some 40 more than the next highest company, Rolls Royce. The GSK cited examples were across a range of disciplines and emanated from 30 UK universities. In my opinion, this is a useful Key Performance Indicator of how good a collaborator the company might be and should be considered by academics seeking an industrial partner.

Other countries are evaluating the benefits of the UK REF exercise to the science base and the economy and some will consider similar exercises in their respective countries. Next year will see the evaluation of impact case studies for the REF2021 exercise; the impact-related funding has been increased from 20% to 25% of the total funding.

Points for Academia to consider when choosing an Industrial Partner

Academics should always undertake some due diligence when considering choosing an industrial partner. They should review the scientific literature to determine whether the industrial scientists are publishing in high impact journals; they should also surf the company website and annual report in order to glean useful background information.

There are several key questions that the academic should ask:
- Does the company have a good track record for collaborations with academia? This can be assessed by searching for joint industry-academic publications in the literature and the number of grants co-funded between the company and the research councils.
- Does the industrial scientist have access to knowledge or technology, which may contribute to the aims of the proposed research? Often the industrial researcher will have proprietary selective ligands or equipment that would not otherwise be available to the academic.
- Is the industrial partner well placed to exploit intellectual property arising from the collaboration in an efficient and effective way? For example, pharmaceutical companies will have I.P. professionals whose sole role is to protect I.P. arising from research.
- Is the industrial scientists likely to make a significant intellectual contribution to the project?

What makes a great Strategic Partnership?

The most important factor in driving any collaboration is regular and honest communication which ultimately results in an appreciation of each other’s capabilities. This develops around a growing trust where effective Chinese walls are honored and respect grows. The science undertaken in the best collaborations is world-leading and results in high impact peer reviewed publications. There is a myth that industry always inhibit publication of their research results. This is simply not true. A brief review of recent journal publications will show how keen companies like GSK are to share their findings through scientific press. It is in the interest of the company to have external scientists read, corroborate and extend their original research findings.

In conclusion, I know that academic collaborations help drive science in my own organization and certainly the industrial research accelerates research findings in the academic space. Academic partnerships are a win-win and GSK will continue to need academia for new technology developments & skills. I look forward to further academic partnerships if we are to innovate and be successful in taking new medicines into the clinic.

IMAGE CREDITS: © GlaxoSmithKline (GSK).
Intelligence Hunt

Exceeding the Comfort Zones, Learning by Sharing and Promoting the Maritime Industry to the Next Generations

Intelligence Hunt is a concept created by SeaFocus just over a year ago to serve the two important challenge areas of the maritime businesses. Shipping industry especially is continuously lacking talents and interests of the future generations as job seekers, and on the other hand, students are lacking direct connections from the industry to differentiate themselves in the job market. Intelligence Hunt aims to support the maritime industry to be seen as the most attractive industry in the world, where the top students compete to get into great positions and where the industry utilizes the modern technologies and top-level intelligence and thus become even more competitive mode of transportation for the shippers.

SeaFocus is a unique business platform, a fully independent and neutral privately run company, which seeks to work for the benefit of the maritime industry. The company is run by ‘waterproof’ entrepreneurs, with backgrounds as shippers, top-level management consultants and industry lobbyists, with a wide and global network. Thus, SeaFocus can react quickly to changes or needs of its partners and stakeholders.

Global teams compete to shape the future of the maritime industry

How does the concept work in practice? The Intelligence Hunt brings together companies and universities to work on real cases and to aim to commercialize out-of-the-box concepts. The roughly two and half months lasting project culminates to the finals twice a year, one in November and the other in May-June. International individual university students are welcomed to apply as candidates, to challenge themselves, their universities, even ultimately the national and international further education systems and structures, as well as cooperating with the industries and the future employers. The cases cover a variety of maritime business areas and current development interests, up to the core logistics challenges or e.g. expansion strategies of the shippers.

The students are chosen to work on a case do not necessarily know each other in advance. They are all from...
different universities and faculties, and from different countries and cultures. They receive mentorship from a top management advisor with a background in international trade and global supply chain management, and report to the company key person, who sometimes even has a position in a company’s management team. This way Intelligence Hunt wants to simulate the future work environment in the global companies, and prepare the students to be more ready to the global corporate working environments.

What do the students gain? They experience the real life timetable and midterm reporting pressure, learn to lead a team formed by different kind of personalities with different kinds of working methods, and be responsible for a case company of the quality of their work. The students in the best case get an internship or a Master’s Thesis theme from their case company, or employed by another company seeing them live on the stage in the finals.

The #IntelligenceHunt3 project finals was on 12th June in Gothenburg. Total of 77 students finished the project and 4 teams were awarded. The winning team of students from Strathclyde University, Glasgow, Åbo Akademi Turku, Finland and Tampere University of Technology will travel to Lisbon in the autumn to a two-day tour hosted by Executive Director of EMSA. The team has received a 2000 € stipend from the Finnish Maritime Foundation and a one year coaching and mentoring programme as individuals or as a team, by a leading expert of terminal operations Mr Frank Kho, Senior Advisor at Kho Management B.V. The Winners will also be sitting in the jury of the #IntelligenceHunt4.

In just 1 month, there has been already three Intelligence Hunt projects, in which altogether 27 case companies have been challenging themselves, the students, the jury and even the audience. A total of 200 students from more than 30 different countries and over 30 different universities so far have gone through the experience of such a new way of project work. From testimonials, one can study the very positive experiences of both the companies and the students.

How can students get involved in the Intelligence Hunt competition?

The #IntelligenceHunt4 student registration has started in June and will finish on the 10th of August. The Finals will take place on the 14th Nov 2018 in Helsinki Onboard M/S Silja Symphony in the Port of Helsinki. SeaFocus again expects to have over 100 students as applicants. From those candidates maximum 60 will be selected to work on maximum 12 different company cases as IntelligenceHunt4 Finalists. The registration form is available for students who are interested in participating in the project.

Also taking a challenge itself, SeaFocus will make a real-life scalability test in 2019, when the #IntelligenceHunt5 Finals take place in conjunction with the Nor-Shipping 2019 in Oslo. Nor-Shipping is on a mission to be the world’s best international maritime meeting place, to be the integral enabler for technology-driven and sustainable business development and the connector between business and academia. SeaFocus plays an important role here, by hosting the Intelligence Hunt at Nor-Shipping on the 4-7th of June 2019, to connect industry with new talents, and exploring new oceansolutions.

We would like to welcome the future looking companies and students to join us to this great journey to the future on board M/S SeaFocus and its Intelligence Hunt and also thank UIIN for our great partnership for the benefit of the future generations.

ULLA KEINO is the Chairman of the SeaFocus Executive Maritime Business Platform.
Foundations for Developing Strategic Partnerships
Perspectives from an Australian University

“Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus” – the global best seller is a great analogy describing the differences between industry and universities in Australia. A lot has been written over recent years about the cultural divide but now more than ever these two sectors must look to develop sustainable, long term relationships to ensure their future success.

An integral building block of UTS’s success, since its inception, has been to be outward looking and focused on partnering with industry. Applying the advancement of knowledge to solve industry challenges is in our DNA, part of our social charter and our commitment to industry and community. Our reputation among leaders in business, the professions and government is that UTS has the most industry-focused approach of all Sydney metropolitan universities [1].

UTS is a university of technology with a distinct practice-oriented model of learning. Innovation and entrepreneurship education is our key driver in our curriculum, preparing our students for the future of work. Emerging tech skills go hand in hand with human skills (creative intelligence, critical thinking, and collaboration). Ranked the No.1 Young University for the last three years, UTS is agile and contemporary, with social justice key to our core and purpose. We are committed to driving social change in the world beyond our campus. UTS is uniquely positioned on the southern fringe of Sydney CBD. The Ultimo precinct is fast becoming Australia’s largest and most vibrant creative digital hub. We hold the enviable position of being surrounded by a high concentration of start-ups, creative firms, large technology, media, education and corporate partners, the Australian Broadcasting Corporation and the Museum of Applied Arts and Sciences.

An Australian Challenge
However, at the macro level Australia ranks last in the OECD for university business collaboration and in respect to the proportion of academics employed by business, Australia ranks 28 out of the 36 OECD countries [2].

Further, in 2016, an OECD paper concluded that Australia’s ROI on innovation spend by government is relatively poor. While Australia is well above average in terms of innovation ‘input’ (relatively strong skill base, reputable universities, etc.), it is subpar in terms of innovation ‘output’. Fundamentally, we are not maximising the economic benefits from what we fund [3].

At UTS we believe there are four external trends that pose an opportunity and challenge to us maintaining the status quo to industry engagement:

Two years ago, UTS established the Corporate Relations Centre. Strategic whole of university partnerships ▶
Driver
Growth of knowledge-intensive companies and technology-based industries.
Local companies facing increased competition from global competitors.
The rise of innovation investors and entrepreneurs inside and outside of the university sector.
Funding, policy and reputational rankings increasingly encourage closer ties between industry and academia.

Opportunity
New opportunities for collaboration with universities across a spectrum of activities: employment, contact research, consulting, commercialisation and thought leadership.
Incumbent companies are required to innovate and must build their innovation capabilities and capacities, as well as explore new alliances for ideas.
Call for rapid development of new knowledge, technology and practice, as well as the need to prepare a workforce to flourish in this new environment.
Support of activities based around new measures of engagement and impact.

are cultivated and managed by a small corporate relations team. This is a central office, reporting into the DVC (Innovation & Enterprise), helping industry navigate the University. It is purposefully a separate function from the research office as research is seen as one of the three key pillars (Students/Graduates, Research and Community) of our strategic partnership model, not the primary driver of industry engagement.

Aside from strategic partnerships, we offer advice and strategy support to our senior leadership to help ensure UTS capitalise and respond to the external conditions. What are the needs of our partners? How can we leverage our infrastructure to help our partners succeed? What are the big ideas from the university community that we can add value to? Where are the collaborative opportunities with other university divisions to develop new service offerings? If we are successful, we will not only support and attract investment to support the university’s core activities but we will be able to measure our impact to the broader community.

How was our Centre developed?
Our starting point or philosophy for building our Centre is that people are a key ingredient in creating sustainable relationships, built on trust, common purpose and mutual benefit. Strategic partnerships is a team sport. Within our team, our primary role is to serve and add value to our internal and our stakeholders. Hiring people with the right mix of skills and experiences in both corporate and the university sector is important. Sharing and living the values of the university is key.

From an operational perspective, there were three key priority projects to establish the centre. Undertaking an audit of our partnerships, establishing a partnership framework and improving the data on relationships.

Audit
Our first project was to identify who our current strategic partners were and understand their motivations and desired outcomes from the relationship. We seek to ensure we do what we say on paper is what we do. This process has increased our knowledge (data) and enabled us to grow our existing relationships. It also helped us identify an evidence-based value proposition for establishing new strategic partnerships.

Framework
Industry has many touch points across the university and it is important that we do not stifle the great work and often specialised work that occurs in Faculties, Research Centres and other Central Divisions. Domain expertise exists outside of our Corporate Relations Centre. Developing a partnership framework that measures and values collaboration is critical. We have and will continue to establish networks and practices that encourages cross-collaboration. To facilitate this, we spent time defining what a strategic partnership is, our team’s role, how we work with our internal partners and our external partners. This is an on-going and iterative body of work. UTS has developed a ‘Partnership Opportunity Brief’, adapted from the MIT Innovation Lab partnership canvas [4]. This tool helps us assess the potential of a strategic partnership but also forms our risk assessment. We are able to use this brief to discuss our partnership plan internally and externally.

Data and Process Customer Relationship Management (CRM) systems can be big and costly systems, especially if they attempt to solve all external engagement needs (i.e. student recruitment, research, internships). We are cautious on CRMs being used to track all engagement at a university. Managing complex and multi-faceted partnerships using email, spreadsheets and other ad hoc programs makes it difficult to deliver value. We have deliberately implemented a small roll-out of a partnership CRM for a limited number of users with specific roles across the university. A partnership CRM is a crucial tool to help track activity, demonstrate value and create transparency across the partnership network to show impact for both the partner and the university. A CRM can be an enabler for cultural change to foster a holistic approach to relationship management.

Remember, this is not easy. Not every relationship should be viewed as a potential strategic partnership. Both university and industry partners need to acknowledge strategic partnership development takes time. It requires a long term view and investment in resources on both sides to ensure the potential for success.

Looking ahead
In a recent speech to the National Press Club, Universities Australia chairperson Margaret Gardiner said that boosting university industry engagement could add up to $10 billion a year to Australia’s GDP. Professor Gardiner cited new modelling commissioned from consultants Cadence Economics, demonstrating that university-industry collaborations generates over $9 billion a year, which could be increased to $30 billion a year if an extra 8000 businesses entered into university-business collaborations [5]. This should be motivation enough for these two sectors to start investing more time and energy into developing sustainable, long term relationships to ensure their future success.

References:
1. Based on 2017 RepTrack Survey.
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JOHN SZABO is the Head of Partnerships, Corporate Relations Centre, University of Technology Sydney.

CAITLIN RUDDOCK is the Director, Corporate Relations Centre, University of Technology Sydney.
Chalmers University of Technology & Göteborg Energi Collaboration Fosters the Birth of a Sustainable Society

A long-term collaboration between Swedish energy company Göteborg Energi (GE) & Chalmers University of Technology revolutionized how the organizations research and implement new energy-related technologies. Despite many previous joint research ventures, GE started measuring the impact of those projects and led to new energy-related innovations.

The overall goal of the partnership formed between GE and Chalmers University was to establish a sustainable society by uniting their respective projects and R&D teams. Most importantly, learning how to turn research into something practical and easy to implement would be useful in future joint ventures with other organizations.

The project teams were organized in 3 specific levels with each level consisting of one team from Chalmers and GE working in conjunction. The first level is top management consisting of the GE CEO & the President of Chalmers with supporting staff that focus on keeping the vision of the project on track. At the second level, the management team focuses on communicating decisions from the top level to the first level and finding new project ideas. The project ideas created by GE’s management team are collaborated on with Chalmers’ Area of Advancement Energy (AoA) Energy department. AoA departments are interdisciplinary departments specializing in specific fields while still focusing on sustainable development. The third level consists of researchers who make improvements on the decisions made from the top and do the implementation of the projects.

The reason behind the success of the system is in participatory decision-making. All levels are given a say on how to improve the project. GE further facilitated communication between levels by establishing so-called “research days”. Research days invite management, engineers, staff, marketing, and recruitment departments together to voice concerns and pitch new ideas. The collaborative relationship between the two organizations continued to be developed through various events hosted by GE at Chalmers University. The best example of GE’s networking efforts are the workshops at Chalmers where students find a solution to a real industrial case. The students who find the most efficient solution to an industrial problem have the possibility to do their master’s thesis at GE.

The results of a new way to collaborate GE & Chalmers have both greatly benefited from the ongoing collaboration in both implementing their research and improving their internal processes. GE received detailed insight into new research areas regarding energy. GE also gained access to an array of highly qualified PhD students who already have experience in solving industrial problems through the workshops GE hosted at Chalmers University of Technology.

One of the most profound results of the joint operation is boost of interest from the third parties. Many of the projects undertaken by the collaborators received external funding from the European Commission and Swedish Energy Agency (e.g. Fossil Free Energy District & GoliGas projects). Projects such as GoliGas, which focused on turning forest waste into methane for use as vehicle fuel, would not be possible without funding from the Swedish Energy Agency. The collaboration was recognized by the Swedish Government for its societal impact. The Swedish government also acknowledged Chalmers’ AoA as a concept that greatly strengthened the university.

Can the strategy of Chalmers-Göteborg Energi for efficient research and implementation be transferred to other collaborations?

The key in effectively transferring their method to other projects is establishing a vision for a long-term collaboration. GE and Chalmers University signed a 10-year agreement with a 10-million-euro budget understanding that building a relationship takes time. Corporations and universities attempting to utilize their method need to understand that communication is crucial. Maintaining transparency about their individual goals and leaving room for equal discussion among all levels of the project is crucial in careful and effective planning of projects.
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Established in 2006 with the merger of two schools, the Ecole supérieure des beaux-arts [School of Fine Arts] and the Haute école d’arts appliqués [School of Applied Arts], both over 200 years old, HEAD – Genève has become one of the foremost art schools in Europe in the last ten years. Many factors have contributed to this significant development, including substantial means, a focus on diversity, and a faculty made up of renowned artists and designers, resulting in the ability to attract a high number of very motivated students. A school of this calibre and level of ambition is an undertaking that cannot confine itself to merely fulfilling traditional teaching and research goals. It must envision a broader mission, encompassing its interrelationship with the world, with society, and with the environment in which it operates. More than a school, it must become a key actor shaping the fabric of the city—not just a key cultural player but also a preferred partner, sought after by socioeconomic and institutional spheres.

In keeping with this holistic vision of the teaching enterprise and cross-fertilising models based on lab work, seminars, and business, HEAD – Genève is multiplying its relationships with socioeconomic partners, at whose behest the school carries out forty to fifty commissions every year. Some of these commissions are modest in scope but have a broader significance, such as the creation of a visual identity for a humanitarian organisation, while others take on a complexity and scale that are unusual for a school. In this regard, let us mention the development of the signage for the WTO headquarters, the creation of a booth representing leading watch brands at Basel World, and recently the stage set for Hermès/petit h’s annual sale. These services are developed via the school’s five main departments—visual arts, film, visual communication, space design and interior architecture, and fashion, jewellery and accessories—and generate close to CHF 1 million in revenue. On the design front, these collaborations involve producing graphics, signage and visual identities, conceiving and carrying out architectural work, developing and manufacturing industrial products and participating in event production. In terms of visual arts, the partnerships give rise to undertakings in public and private spaces and to participation in cultural events such as festivals, exhibitions, biennials, and art fairs. So as not to compete, even within its limited scope, on terms that could be considered unfair, the school prices its services at market rates.

These creative opportunities on a 1:1 scale result from a strategy that HEAD – Genève has been developing since the school’s inception, which rests upon three key principles: (i) to do more than what is typically expected from a school; (ii) to play a political role and be an actor in the city; and (iii) to think about teaching in terms of professional outcomes. In contrast to the notion of school as a sanctuary operating in isolation with no direct links to the "real world", HEAD – Genève prefers the more up-to-date concept of a melting pot of interactions and partnerships that enrich all involved.
School as an integral part of the local ecosystem

An internationally renowned school must reflect the essence of the setting in which it operates. In view of the multifaceted socioeconomic circumstances it must navigate, HEAD – Genève develops its activities at the intersection of these various dimensions. Clearly reflecting its roots in the city of Geneva, in terms of both its many resources and numerous contradictions, the school works both with the WTO and the luxury goods sector as well as with NGOs, organisations that fight illiteracy, LGBTQ groups, associations defending asylum rights, etc. The school is present in all aspects of the life of the city, while itself being inclusive and impacted by all the questions and issues affecting the city. This multidimensional positioning is a challenge, but to be able to afford a glimpse of this “post-school” reality in which students will have to find their place is also a significant pedagogical opportunity.

“Playing for real”: School is no longer a simulated environment

Time spent as a student in an arts and design school is often one of utopian enthusiasm. It is a protected environment enabling students to sharpen their skills and discover their own language. This invaluable aspect of higher education is paradoxically at the source of the frightening chasm that opens up at the feet of recent art and design graduates: the reality of the creative endeavor in an actual professional environment.

Working on concrete projects in collaboration with organisations outside the school constitutes a way of addressing this situation, of anticipating it. It offers an experience that is not typically available in a traditional pedagogical framework, integrating the issues of creation, invention, and personal creativity into an actual socioeconomic reality. Indeed, while the projects are conducted under the supervision and with the support of faculty, fulfilling the various mandates and commissions is always and above all the responsibility of the students. Any ideas presented to clients are theirs and they own the entire research and creation process. In this manner, students perceive the trust placed in them by the clients and the school and from that, they draw a singular motivation and a pride that is invaluable to their future career. This real-world creative experience also gives them legitimacy and makes them particularly attractive on the job market: They graduate with a portfolio including projects that have actually been realized, in partnership with significant economic actors, and of which they are the creators or co-creators. Finally, those collaborative creation processes amongst students, who are encouraged to establish work teams, promote a balance between competition and solidarity—indeed, many executive teams originally constituted in the school setting subsequently set themselves up as studios or collectives, often multidisciplinary, in part as a result of those real-world experiences conducted while in school. Contrary to certain preconceived ideas, these commissions do not, a priori, eliminate the freedom intrinsic to the creative process or the utopian element that students fundamentally seek: Not only do these commissions retain a fundamental element of freedom, they constitute a carefully measured ingredient in an educational undertaking that involves very diverse work situations, from the research lab to the professional production studio.

The attractiveness of schools for socioeconomic partners

As brands sometimes entrust us with significant aspects of their future or their image, it is interesting to ask what makes HEAD – Genève such an attractive partner. First and foremost, however, let us emphasise that en
gaging in a partnership with the school is never a function of minimizing costs. The school’s success must thus be based on something else. The distinctiveness of a school like HEAD – Genève resides in its students’ particular critical insight and singular outlook and in the multiplicity of their ideas. In the mad rush of research and innovation, those very young creators, still unscathed, are able to sense the shape of things to come. This promise of the unexpected is complemented by the vast diversity of approaches and visions that is fostered by the simultaneous work of several teams on the same project. This richness is directly related to the school environment and cannot be offered by a traditional professional creative entity.

The pedagogical aspect of these collaborations is the source of another advantage noted by our partners, namely, a greater level of involvement of the clients in the creative process. They have to engage, explain and elaborate on the details of their project, its characteristics and development, etc. This situation is much more challenging and thus much more interesting and stimulating for the clients.

Finally, it is important to mention the symbolic added value of this type of collaboration. Historically, Switzerland has developed a very strong connection between the business world and professional training. It is gratifying for a Swiss entrepreneur to be involved in training young people and it is without undue pride that we can assert that the involvement of HEAD – Genève has become an assurance of quality in this respect.

Freedom to contract: Never undertake commissions for the wrong reasons

HEAD – Genève receives quasi-daily inquiries from potential business partners, and the school turns down more commissions than it accepts. The Sviss educational system grants the school the immense privilege of not having to depend on business collaborations to survive, which means that the school can avoid finding itself reliant on its partners. HEAD – Genève is thus never tempted to accept a commission or working conditions with which it is not entirely comfortable. This radical freedom is essential to the pursuit of the pedagogical undertaking to which the various commissions and mandates contribute. Engaging in a partnership thus depends strictly on its relevance to the curriculum and to the students. Commissions are taken under consideration only with regard to the degree of stimulation, creative challenge and particular experience they may offer students and teachers. In our vision, questions regarding the image, renown, or prestige of a partnership are much less important and financial considerations are not even part of the picture.

This means that, ever vigilant, we are always in control, and contrary to any mode of subjection, we are fully able to impose our ethics and the moral principles that underlie our position as artists and designers and responsible participants in social life.

A SCHOOL OF THIS CALIBRE AND LEVEL OF AMBITION IS AN UNDERTAKING THAT CANNOT CONFINE ITSELF TO MERELY FULFILLING TRADITIONAL TEACHING AND RESEARCH GOALS. IT MUST ENVISION A BROADER MISSION, ENCOMPASSING ITS INTERRELATIONSHIP WITH THE WORLD, WITH SOCIETY, AND WITH THE ENVIRONMENT IN WHICH IT OPERATES.
L

ike all kinds of organisations, universities look to access new audiences and enter new markets by reaching out to resource holders and diverse constituencies outside their standard remit. This is what happens when universities establish university-industry centres – industry has requirements and agendas that may differ from a university’s mainstream academic agenda. Yet working with industry is key as it helps a university raise resources, diversify risk and reach out to wider society.

How can universities manage this kind of stakeholder diversification so that everyone comes out of it better off? How can they balance who they already are – or are perceived to be – and what they already do, with the goals, objectives and modus operandi of industry?

Three things you must do: leveraging, hybridizing, bolstering.

One way to achieve this is to build specialised units or centres within the university: units that, on the one hand, operate independently, but on the other hand form an integral part of the mainstream academic organisation while making it work for the new audience. In other words, they have to stick to what they do best. We call this leveraging. For a university with an industry-funded research unit, this means bringing the industrial sponsor, rather than the academic science, to the table. This may mean, for instance, to focus on projects where open publishing is not an option without the consent of the industrial sponsor.

Second, they have to ensure the needs of both the mainstream and the incoming entities are met by mixing the way they work. We call this hybridizing. This needs to be done in dialogue and a kind of iterative process that establishes objectives and expectations as they hybridise activities and goals. For instance, small adjustments to open publishing are often needed as the confidentiality of commercially sensitive information needs to be safeguarded.

And, third, universities with hybrid spaces need to safeguard the integrity of the organisation at large, by bolstering their own talent and resources. Researchers going into an industry-funded centre need to be permitted to pursue their own work ethics and methodologies – they need to be allowed to be academics.
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What may happen if the design is not right

Failing to take these three actions can lead to things unravelling fast. Take the case of the University of California at Berkeley. Back in 1999, the university signed a deal with pharmaceutical behemoth Novartis to fund research within the Department of Plant and Microbial Biology to the tune of $25 million. In exchange for the cash, Novartis was to have first dibs on licence negotiations for around a third of the department’s total scientific output. The company was also given two of five seats on the department’s research committee, the body that determines how money is spent.

The resultant outcry by Berkeley faculty about the deal’s potential to undermine the independence of academic science met echoing volleys from students and alumni. They circulated a petition decrying the Novartis deal’s potential to undermine the independence of academic science, and authored a study that showed the potential impact on academic output. The company was今生 two of five seats on the department’s research committee, the body that determines how money is spent.
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From Ad-hoc to Strategic Partnerships in University-Industry Relations

In an interview with Ulm, Dr. Max Riedel and Dr. Lars Frølund shared their insights into the status and future trajectories of industry collaboration with universities, and discussed the journey of their new book “Strategic Industry-University Partnerships: Success-Factors from Innovative Companies”, recently published by Elsevier.

H: Can you shortly introduce your book to us?
M: The book is on success factors in University Industry Collaboration, from an industrial perspective. We asked eight big companies to share with the readers the way they work with universities. The chapters focus on what the authors think that their companies are doing specifically well when interacting in a strategic way with universities. Note that when we say strategic, we do not necessarily mean big money, we mean collaborating in a systematic way. We have structured the book along five main success factors, which are, selecting the right topics, selecting the right partners, selecting the matching formats, having dedicated people, organization and processes, and evaluating partnerships using suitable KPIs. And most importantly, aligning all these to your business goals, your reasons why you collaborate in the first place.

H: Did you do your investigation based on this framework?
L: We did not start the book project with a fixed conceptualisation of the whole area, though we started with what we called the “collaboration lifecycle”. It was very much an iterative process working together with the companies, and finding out “What do we actually think this to be part of a project. Many authors took the time to attend two full-day workshops about. Our analysis of the need was right, and we were really happy when Klaus Schwab, the president and founder of the World Economic Forum (WEF), agreed to write the foreword. This was also a confirmation of what we are writing about is relevant to people.

H: How about the involvement of companies? What was their motivation to get involved in your project?
L: Most of the companies featured in the book participated, not only to showcase to the world why they are good, but also to be part of a project. Many authors took the time to attend two full-day workshops to develop the book as a whole. It gave them an opportunity to build a trusted network of people in similar positions. Many edited volumes in the academic world are simply developed by collecting works that are already there. In this book, however, we had to work with companies, as a group, to find out what we want to do together, and how the best book would look like. In the end, Max and I had the steering of it, as editors, but also as project managers.

H: How do you think this project will evolve in the future?
L: This could serve as a starting point to bring together companies. They often do not have similar associations or networks that the universities have to discuss university industry collaboration. M: I think the big difference is that for the universities, industry relations have become part of their third mission, which has triggered discussions among many on how to make universities more innovative, more catering to the needs of the industry, or how to collaborate more. Whereas for the industry, university relations is only one of many tools to access innovation. So industry is not as present in these discussions as the universities are.

H: Is your book a useful resource for industry professionals?
L: This is a question we often get. Most countries have an enormous amount of SMEs, and if we want to change the way university and industry work together, it’s much better to have the SMEs do this rather than the big companies. Going back to one very important point Max made in the beginning of the interview: what do we mean by “strategic”? By strategic we do not mean that everybody has to sign a $30mil. agreement with the Technical University Munich or MIT, but it means that the activities are well thought through, well structured, and systematic. An SME may not be able to do the same things as Siemens, but the good thing is that it doesn’t have to. An SME does not need a big internal program, maybe employees can just go and talk to each other. Important is that they move away from being opportunistic, as for example in only relying on a single university professor that has helped starting the company, and waiting for several years before starting a more systematic approach that also includes other universities. Short answer to your question is yes, because, nobody, not even small companies can afford not to be systematic.

H: Do you think it is more so about changing the mindset?
L: Yes, changing the mindset and moving away from this ad-hoc opportunistic way of working with universities is what we say is going to deliver value to any company, large, small, medium size. If you are serious about university collaboration, start looking into the matter seriously.
Entrepreneurial Mindset: The Secret Ingredient to Successful Industry-University Partnerships

University faculty members can no longer rely solely on government funding to support their research pursuits. They must seek out industry partnerships for critical resources to drive diverse, cutting-edge research initiatives.

In a recent VentureWell article, 4 Ways Faculty Can Make and Keep Strong Industry Partnerships, Elizabeth Adams, assistant vice president for research administration at the University of Virginia, noted that faculty members need to “take hold of their own research program like a CEO.”

I couldn’t agree more.

To establish and maintain solid industry partnerships, research faculty need to think and act like entrepreneurs: actively seeking out new customers (industry partners), developing a sustainable business model (partnership), maximizing new customers (industry partners), developing a sustainable business model (partnership), maximizing tight budgets, and pitching value and ideas to potential partners.

During a panel about industry-university partnerships, I presented at the VentureWell conference, OPEN 2018, a majority of faculty attendees asked how they can effectively engage with industry. My response: start by applying an entrepreneurial mindset to all stages of the industry-university partnership. Below are four components of an entrepreneurial mindset that can help university research faculty develop partnerships with industry.

Develop Relationships
Nurturing potential industry partners for the long haul requires fostering authentic connections from the start. To accomplish this, it’s important for faculty to avoid transactional relationship tactics - especially in the early stages of the relationship. Instead, they need to consider building relationship management, interpersonal communications, and customer service skills. Once the relationship is established, meeting in person as much as possible will help maintain the connection. That should include visiting the industry partner’s headquarters to show commitment. There are many books that illustrate ways to build strong business relationships such as To Sell is Human by author and OPEN 2017 keynote speaker, Daniel Pink.

Get Out of the Lab
Connecting with potential industry partners doesn’t happen in isolation. It’s important for faculty to actively and strategically engage with industry to understand what the university can bring to the potential partnership. Attending industry-related trade shows or conferences is a good place to start. It allows faculty to identify potential university champions at companies and find out critical information such as: What’s their role and function? Are they already involved with industry-university partnerships? What are their partnership needs? These events also allow faculty to take the industry’s temperature. For instance, what are the common or major industry challenges? What are some research gaps and needs?

Of course, if time and budget constraints prohibit it attending trade shows and conferences, faculty can easily find ways to connect with champions via LinkedIn or meet with ones from local companies. It can be as simple as meeting for lunch or coffee, or inviting the champion to speak with students about industry trends in the classroom.

Listen, Ask Questions, Listen Some More
While it’s easy to get excited about the nuances of an academic research project, it’s important for faculty to refrain from dominating the conversation. Instead, it’s important that they listen carefully to the industry partner to uncover the company’s needs and pain points. Faculty can also probe deeper by asking “why?” whenever possible. That will help faculty understand if and how the university’s research initiatives can solve the potential partner’s problem. A book like Talking to Humans is a good source for research faculty to learn listening and interviewing techniques.

Pitch Partnership Benefits
As the relationship between faculty and industry partner progresses, there will come a point where the faculty member must illustrate the value of the relationship. Dr. David Grewell, Director of the Center for Bioplastics and Biocomposites (CB2), is very successful at collaborating with industry. He is an active part of the National Science Foundation’s (NSF) Industry-University Cooperative Research Centers Program (IUCRC). Much of Dr. Grewell’s success centers on his ability to illustrate how industry can benefit from a collaboration with CB2. For instance, he focuses on how CB2 industry partners have been able to leverage their funds by a 1:5 ratio. He also shares examples of technologies that have gone to market as a result of the partnership. His pitch also includes names of students employed by industry partners, which is further testimony to the value industry sees in the partnership.

As the engagement between academic research faculty and industry becomes a common pathway for research and commercialization, it’s critical for faculty to consider the ingredients that can lead to productive and long-term relationships. Experience shows that one of the most important strategies for faculty to forge successful partnerships is developing an entrepreneurial mindset. Doing so can transform an academic research faculty into constant problem/solution seekers, active network builders, and effective value creators.

The article is originally published in the LinkedIn profile of the author.
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A New Institute to Improve the Ethiopian Higher Education Sector

While the Ethiopian government is leading the country steadily towards its industrial age through far-reaching reform agendas, the higher education sector addressing the people’s expectations remains a struggle. Tertiary providers, and the sector as a whole, must respond to societal demands, tackle social problems and fill knowledge gaps. All of these responsibilities call for evidence-based policies, strategies and implementation plans at the national and institutional levels. But policymaking, strategizing, and implementing need good leadership, developed through academic programmes, professional trainings or experience. Building the Country’s Leadership and Management in Higher Education

EIHE aspires to be recognized as an exemplary and responsive national centre for higher education leadership and management by 2022. Therefore, preparing tomorrow’s higher education leaders is probably its most important activity. The Institute will train university leaders through its flagship programme eHELP (Ethiopian Higher Education Leadership Programme). But EIHE also believes that simply offering one-off centralized trainings will not do. Although eHELP targets Deans, in the near future EIHE will provide training for top-level leaders (Presidents and Vice-Presidents). EIHE will also support eHELP alumni in delivering trainings for mid-level leaders in their regional clusters and for lower-level leaders within their own universities.

Moreover, enhancing effectiveness and efficiency requires skilled human resources with a robust understanding of their contexts, their roles, responsibilities and accountability. But this means that the higher education community must stay up to date and follow all relevant policies, strategies, guidelines and bylaws. With this in mind, EIHE will provide different stakeholders the opportunity to remain abreast of the most recent developments. Based on the needs expressed by higher education institutions, the Ministry of Education or other higher education regulatory bodies the Institute will design and offer tailor-made need-based training programmes.

Creating a Platform for Open Discussion

As important as leadership trainings are, we would be misguided if we considered them the solution to all of Ethiopia’s higher education questions. Sharing knowledge on the most momentous higher education problems, finding common solutions, and discussing with higher education scholars from across the world, is just as important.

In this spirit, the EIHE has developed an initiative to create a platform for discussion, and sharing knowledge and practice among invited scholars, the university community, the higher education regulatory bodies and the wider society on the most relevant higher education themes. This initiative, called ‘Higher Education Learning Lab’ (HELL), is designed as a series of events with defining features to promote its sustainability and broad participation. Each HELL will include a specific theme, rotating hosting universities, keynote offers by distinguished international speakers to steer the discussion, and a participatory decision on the next priority theme.

Evidence-Based Policy Advice

As globalization and internationalization dawned on the 21st century, the challenges facing higher education increased in complexity and magnitude. Today, national higher education policy needs to be monitored, developed and revised in light of global trends, and the higher education community must be involved in the process. Based on the knowledge that will be constructed through HELL, research and experience, EIHE offers policy advice to higher education institutions, frontline ministries and other stakeholders.

Who are we?

The initiative to establish the Institute came from the Ministry of Education. The Institute is hosted at Addis Ababa University (AAU), the oldest and most prominent university in the country. Yet, although it is hosted at AAU, EIHE belongs to all and it serves the entire Ethiopian higher education system. EIHE’s success relies on the support of the higher education community, its encouragement and sense of ownership. In June 2018 EIHE kicked-off its activities in Addis Ababa with its first eHELP seminar for 22 Deans from 17 universities, a high-profile inaugural conference, and the first HELL Symposium on the theme of ‘Internationalization of Higher Education’. The Conference, which included speeches from internationally renowned scholars, was attended by all key players in Ethiopia’s higher education landscape. The State Minister for higher education, Presidents and international relations officers of all public and private universities, and representatives of the higher education regulatory bodies, of the German Embassy and of GIZ were in attendance.

The feedback received during and after the launching week is very encouraging. The Institute is currently planning the next eHELP seminars and its second learning lab on universities’ social responsibility. Through GIZ-Ethiopia and the ‘STEP programme’ (Sustainable Training and Education Programme), the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development finances the Institute’s leadership and management component.

For the next couple of years, with GIZ support, an international consortium including the Dutch Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS) and the German Centre for Higher Education (CHE) will work closely with EIHE in the design and delivery of eHELP and related activities.

GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES

EIHE AIMS TO BE RECOGNIZED AS AN EXEMPLARY AND RESPONSIVE NATIONAL CENTRE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT BY 2020. PREPARING TOMORROW’S HIGHER EDUCATION LEADERS IS ITS MOST IMPORTANT ACTIVITY

AEBEW YIRGA ADAMU is the Director of EIHE and a graduate of the University of Tampere, Finland.

LEON CREMONINI is the Managing Director of EIHE and a former researcher at CHEPS.
CSIRO’s D61+ Platform Connects Australia’s Research Expertise with Innovators across the Globe

We are introducing new partnerships with industry and researchers and the platform is designed to create effective ways to work together. The focus is on building the right collaborations and leveraging the power of expertise to achieve outcomes.

The platform has been designed to align with the Australian Government’s vision for innovation and industry collaboration. It is built on the principles of open innovation, where industry and government work together to identify opportunities, explore solutions, and co-create value.

The D61+ Platform is a cross-sector platform connecting business, industry, and government researchers. It is built on the principles of open innovation, where industry and government work together to identify opportunities, explore solutions, and co-create value.

The platform has been designed to align with the Australian Government’s vision for innovation and industry collaboration. It is built on the principles of open innovation, where industry and government work together to identify opportunities, explore solutions, and co-create value.

The platform has been designed to align with the Australian Government’s vision for innovation and industry collaboration. It is built on the principles of open innovation, where industry and government work together to identify opportunities, explore solutions, and co-create value.

The platform has been designed to align with the Australian Government’s vision for innovation and industry collaboration. It is built on the principles of open innovation, where industry and government work together to identify opportunities, explore solutions, and co-create value.

The platform has been designed to align with the Australian Government’s vision for innovation and industry collaboration. It is built on the principles of open innovation, where industry and government work together to identify opportunities, explore solutions, and co-create value.

The platform has been designed to align with the Australian Government’s vision for innovation and industry collaboration. It is built on the principles of open innovation, where industry and government work together to identify opportunities, explore solutions, and co-create value.
University–Industry–Government Partnerships for Innovation in Paraguay

Science and Technology Parks play a strategic role as articulator for interactions between Universities, Industries and Government. In Paraguay, the Itaipu Technological Park (ITP-PY) promotes an innovation culture in articulation with Government, Academia, Companies and Society, to contribute to integral and sustainable development of the country through technological innovation and knowledge transfer.

Recently, some initiatives of collaboration between Universities, Industries and Government were identified in Paraguay, representing a spark for the National Science, Technology and Innovation System, where linking up these sectors was a main issue to consider. In 2017, the ITP-PY started taking a very relevant role, asking questions such as, “Which are the main particularities in our local ecosystem?” “Which are the most relevant local initiatives in this field?” “Can we effectively connect our research to innovation and solve our complex problems?” Of course we can, we are Paraguayans! However, we needed to start discussing HOW. As a first step, the ITP-PY evaluated the main internal programs, proposals and ideas that stimulate interactions between the mentioned sectors. Here, we started developing a local framework of tools and mechanisms, based on specific Research, Development and Innovation projects, to iteratively test the designed framework on relevant knowledge and business fields that could improve identified particularities of the current local collaboration ecosystem [1].

At the same time, we identified that several other Paraguayan organizations already knew that strengthening interactions and complementing institutional missions should reflect in an efficient and productive innovation ecosystem. In this case, strategic partnerships may represent great opportunities for the development of the country, and further advance our first initiatives. Here, another challenge appeared: “WHERE can Paraguayan organizations meet to discuss about challenges, and subsequently start related strategic partnerships in different relevant productive sectors?” We needed a SPACE for this. Inspired in what we saw is happening around the world, presenting our research work and experiences [2,3], in 2018 the ITP-PY accepted the challenge to create this space in Paraguay, organizing the 1st Paraguayan Workshop for the University-Industry-Government Interaction.

The Results

The 1st Paraguayan Workshop for University-Industry-Government Interaction was a huge success, including more than 500 participants on national and international keynote sessions and discussion panels on Strategic Issues for Development, Energy and Information and Communications Technology. In a two-day workshop, we received more than 50 local institutions and more than 20 papers were presented. The most valuable result was creating that SPACE, the WHERE to start discussing the HOW. Creating this SPACE has let us see several emerging initiatives, all aiming for the same goal: proposing-experimenting-improving ways to effectively and efficiently interact with another sector to complement particular requirements. Here, a quote from Alvin Toffler should perfectly describe our vision: “You’ve got to think about big things while you’re doing small things, so that all the small things go in the right direction”.

Strategic partnerships, in most cases, improve a vision on addressing a particular problem. For our case, we decided to continue improving our first prototypes framework [1] by building strategic partnerships with relevant institutions on each specific considered knowledge and business fields. A Technical Cooperation Agreement, recently signed with the Paraguayan Chamber of Software Industry (CISOFT), is a clear example that building long-term partnerships is an effective way for further advance a particular challenge. We are also expanding our initiatives to other countries in LATAM, looking to extend particularly the South American network [4].

REFERENCES:
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- p. 40 (left) - Agreement of Technical Cooperation, Authorities of ITP-PY and CISOFT. ©Itaipu Technological Park

FABIO LÓPEZ-PIRES currently works on Universities-Industry-Government Interaction initiatives at the Itaipu Technological Park in Paraguay, where he also coordinates the Center for Innovation in Education.
ERASmus for Young Entrepreneurs Program at Technical University of Eindhoven


"THE ERASMUS PROGRAM FOR YOUNG ENTREPRENEURS IS SPECIALLY DESIGNED FOR PEOPLE WITH A THIRST FOR LEARNING AND THE AMBITION TO START A BUSINESS FOR THEMSELVES ONE DAY. AFTER MY GRADUATION, THIS FELT LIKE THE PERFECT FIT. CREATING AND LEARNING IN A REAL COMPANY, WHERE EVERYTHING YOU DO MAKE A DIFFERENCE"

INGE PEETERS, 30MINMBA


Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs (EYE) helps provide aspiring European entrepreneurs with the skills necessary to start and successfully run a small business in Europe. New entrepreneurs gather and exchange knowledge and business ideas with an experienced entrepreneur, with whom they stay and collaborate for a period of 1 to 6 months. The stay is partly financed by the European Commission.

As part of the program, new entrepreneurs benefit from on-the-job training in a small or medium-sized enterprise elsewhere in the Participating Countries. This both eases the successful start of a business and strengthens the new entrepreneur. New entrepreneurs also benefit from access to new markets, international cooperation and potential possibilities for collaboration with business partners abroad. Host entrepreneurs, on the other hand benefit from fresh ideas from a motivated new entrepreneur on their business. The new entrepreneurs may have specialised skills or knowledge in an area the host has not yet mastered. Most host entrepreneurs enjoy the experience so much that they decide to host other new entrepreneurs afterwards.

It is a win-win collaboration where both parties can also discover new European markets or business partners, different ways of doing business. On the longer-term, they can benefit from wide networking opportunities, and, possibly, decide to continue the collaboration as long-term business partners (e.g., joint ventures, sub-contracting activities, contractor-supplier relationships, etc.).

What is the role of the Technical University of Eindhoven within the program?

Reconfirm-TU/e is part of the Technical University of Eindhoven (TU/e) and is one of the local contact points for the programme. The unit is one of the intermediate supporting organisations collaborating in the consortium of EYE in Europe, which means that the university has close relations to Portugal, Germany (Munich), Greece, Spain (Madrid), Lithuania (Vilnius), Poland, the UK and Italy.

With the consortium’s strong focus on Tech, the TU/e strongly supports the start-up scenes of the Brainport region, which includes the entire city of Eindhoven. For the TU/e, internationalisation and European mindset are very important themes. This is one of the reasons why the university accepted the challenge of starting a new European project, next to the ‘regular’ Erasmus programme. The initiative at TU/e has achieved many successful exchanges so far. The programme has brought many international and tech entrepreneurs to the ecosystem of Eindhoven. It is great to see how young, starting entrepreneurs get a chance to explore the entire world of entrepreneurship.

A success story

Many participants have benefited from wide networking opportunities and a number of entrepreneurs decided to continue their collaboration. They became long-term business partners! Here we present you a success story that is told by Inge Peeters from 30minMBA.

Inge, why Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs?

“The Erasmus program for Young Entrepreneurs is specially designed for people with a thirst for learning and the ambition to start a business for themselves one day. After my graduation, this felt like the perfect fit. Creating and learning in a real company, where everything you do makes a difference. The program connected me with 30minMBA, an award-winning startup in Stockholm. Two Skype meetings, a cultural test for cultural fit, a strength test and a final ‘goal document’ later, I was on a plane to Stockholm. Therése Gedda, the Founder and CEO of 30minMBA, told me during one of our Skype sessions that this exchange would not be about traveling. “If you want to see Sweden, you shouldn’t work here. If you want to grow professionally, this is the place to be.” My expectations were set: working hard to learn a lot. Let’s go.

Did it empower you?

“In November 2017 I arrived in Stockholm. Entering 30minMBA, Therése took me under her wings and taught me how to fly. Let me introduce you to Therése: she is the Founder and CEO of 30minMBA. As a keynote speaker, she travels the world talking about topics including workplace engagement, business culture, innovation, mindset, lifestyle design, wellbeing, and The Future of Work. These topics led us to interesting conversations that continued. Her purpose in life is to empower individuals to reach their full potential. I am proud to say I am one of those individuals she empowered! We became long-term business partners.”

Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs goes global

This builds on the programme with the aim to extend the geographical borders beyond Europe. The three beautiful destinations are the USA (states of New York and Pennsylvania), Israel and Singapore. This entrepreneurship exchange lasts between 1-3 months for European New Entrepreneurs (open only for European residents). The New Entrepreneur receives a grant, a lump sum to cover travel costs as well as a monthly subsistence allowance of €1,000, which are offered by the EU.

The EYE Global can be considered as an exchange mentorship programme. For the new entrepreneur, the benefits are acquiring experience and advice from an experienced entrepreneur, developing international contacts, and gaining knowledge about foreign markets. On the other hand, host entrepreneurs get the opportunity to access new skills and innovative knowledge, work with fresh minds, gain ‘intelligence’ about foreign markets, and establish new business partnerships with an entrepreneur from Europe.

Interested?

Reconfirm-TU/e is the local contact point at the TU Eindhoven. You can find more information on our website: www.tue.nl/reconfirm. Want to get involved right away? You can apply on www.erasmus-entrepreneurs.eu and make sure to select TU/e as your contact point! ■

IMAGES CREDIT: ©Technical University of Eindhoven

MAKE SMITS is the Project Manager of Erasmus for Young Entrepreneurs program at TU Eindhoven (Technical University of Eindhoven).
Engaging Early Stage Researchers with Regional Stakeholders

RUNIN Summer School

Universities have been key partners in driving innovation in complex regional settings, but what makes their relationships with local actors strategic, sustainable, and mutually beneficial? RUNIN – a university network programme exploring the Role of Universities in Innovation and Regional Development – aims to connect academic knowledge creators to regional stakeholders and gain a better understanding of the patterns and peculiarities of university-regional collaborations. The programme trains the next generation of experts on university engagement with regional stakeholders and gain a better understanding of the various dimensions of university-industry proximities.

Lastly, RUNIN’s overall topic comprises four thematic areas, each forming a distinct thematic work package.

Relevant research topics

RUNIN’s overall topic comprises four thematic areas, each forming a distinct thematic work package. Four PhD projects under the theme ‘People and Networks’ investigate the role of academics and their networking in universities’ exchanges with the wider society. Two projects, in particular, focus on skills development and the career of doctoral students. Three PhD projects on ‘Places and Territories’ seek to explain the role of spatial aspects in structuring university-firm interactions. Here, the core topics are the connection between regional and global knowledge flows, differences between metropolitan and peripheral regions, and the various dimensions of university-industry proximities. Lastly, four PhD projects in the work package of ‘Practices and Governance’ examine how universities modify their stakeholder interaction arrangements when they encounter new types of industries and businesses, social entrepreneurship, and the involvement of citizens in regional innovation processes. The 14 individual research projects are about halfway through, and RUNIN makes sure that emerging findings will be relevant for immediate users by maintaining a practical focus on the policy needs of regional stakeholders, and by developing practical skills of early stage researchers in the course of eight training sessions.

Cross-sector employability

Each training week of the RUNIN programme is hosted by one of the partner organisations and address a specific set of transferable skills which can be utilised across employment sectors. Some of the targeted capabilities include presentation and dissemination of research results, communication and public engagement, impact evaluation, networking and career development, teamwork and cultural adaptation, entrepreneurial opportunity recognition, project management, and promotion of new ideas. RUNIN fellows are coached by both experienced academics and practitioners involved in strategic regional innovation activities – policymakers, knowledge transfer officers, local entrepreneurs, etc. This summer, the researchers got together in the region of Twente in East Netherlands for a training that focused on the transferable skills of teamwork and communication.

Twente summer school: engaging early stage researchers with regional partners

The school, themed with practical exercises that directly connected RUNIN students to policymakers and wider public. Working in teams, they interviewed representatives of local universities, municipalities, and other organisations, and reflected on how to improve the collaboration between higher education institutions and their partners in Twente. In the end, the students pitched their policy recommendations to the Chair of the Twente Board, a regional association for economic development and innovation. To be able to relate to different audiences through the mass media, PhD candidates tried the genres of blog and press-release. Furthermore, with the help of a regional broadcaster Twente, they practised turning academic findings into a captivating story for local radio listeners and TV viewers. Not least importantly, the engagement skills of the RUNIN fellows got a boost during a Think Tank event in Design Lab, a knowledge exchange centre at the University of Twente. Young scholars acted as discussion leaders facilitating a dialogue between university members and local public in a World Café setup, collecting insights into how the University of Twente could bring education and research closer to societal needs and enhance its regional impact. As a result, these early stage researchers develop into skilled institutional navigators who are able to move the ties between academia and regional partners to a deeper strategic level.

The RUNIN network programme has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under grant agreement No 722495. For more information on the programme, please visit runinproject.eu. ©RUNIN

SOFYA KOPELYAN is a RUNIN PhD Candidate at Center for Higher Education Policy Studies, University of Twente.

SAEED MOGHADAM SAMAN is a RUNIN PhD Candidate at Universitetet i Stavanger.
Upcoming Events

Knowledge sharing, building new relationships and discovering solutions are the core elements of our events. Join the largest conference in this field, or attend one of our professional development workshops.

TO ATTEND:

CREATE STRATEGIC INDUSTRY PARTNERSHIPS
8-9 OCTOBER 2018

Everybody wants to develop their business contacts into strategic business partnerships. But what does "strategic" really mean and how to do it? Based on years of research, numerous case studies, benchmarking with multinational companies and practical experience from both business and universities, we have identified five success factors for creating and sustaining strategic partnerships. In this workshop you will use the Partnership Canvas as a tool to assess and develop your institutions partnership approach along these success factors.

THE ENTREPRENEURIAL UNIVERSITY
27-28 NOVEMBER 2018

Are you interested in joining the workshop and an international network of professionals passionate about creating and sustaining entrepreneurial universities? Working together with the author of the book 'Entrepreneurship at University' and a member of the European Commission's HEInnovate tool facilitators group, the aim of the workshop is to highlight practical steps that you will be able to take to help your university to become more entrepreneurial.

ENTREPRENEURIAL LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION
29-30 NOVEMBER 2018

With an ever-greater shift towards educating more entrepreneurial and innovative students and practicing academic entrepreneurship, universities need more entrepreneurial leaders. Join this workshop, which explores the challenges of leading in Higher Education.

2019 ASIA-PACIFIC UNIVERSITY-INDUSTRY ENGAGEMENT CONFERENCE
11-13 FEBRUARY 2019

The University-Industry Engagement conference will bring together diverse university engagement managers, researchers, policymakers and innovation and entrepreneurship managers. UTS will become an innovative hub over the course of 5 days, offering dynamic networks, access to a variety of presentations alongside workshops from key academics and practitioners on university-industry engagement. Hosted in the heart of Sydney, the conference is a unique opportunity to share, learn and network.
Recent Reports and Books

In this issue our selection of the most recent publications focuses on innovation trends and performance, best practices of sustainable campus practices, and the rising importance of the chief innovation officers at universities.

TO READ:

THE STATE OF UNIVERSITY-BUSINESS COOPERATION IN EUROPE. FINAL REPORT
2018 | Edited by Todd Davey, Arno Meerman, Victoria Galan Muros, Balzhan Orazbayeva, Thomas Baaken

This report presents the findings of the project 'The State of University-Business Cooperation in Europe', conducted during 2016 and 2017 by a consortium led by the Science-to-Business Marketing Research Centre, Germany for the DG Education and Culture, European Commission. The project explored the state of play of UBC in different countries, examining the form and extent of main drivers and barriers for the different stakeholders, regulatory frameworks and the type and extent of existing measures supporting UBC at a national level.

THE FUTURE OF UNIVERSITIES THOUGHTBOOK
2018 | Edited by Todd Davey, Arno Meerman, Balzhan Orazbayeva, Max Riedel, Victoria Galán-Muros, Carolin Plewa, Natascha Eckert

The Future of Universities Thoughtbook brings together 40 perspectives on the future of universities and how they could potentially impact the world and their community over the next 22 years. Leading international thought and practice leaders from business, the higher education sector, science, policy agencies, and governments will explore the topic of university engagement through an inspiring collection of thoughts, ideas and discoveries explaining how universities and their partners will shape our knowledge-driven future.

BUSINESS MODELS FOR STRATEGIC INNOVATION
2018 | Edited by S.M. Riad Shams, Demetris Vrontis, Yaakov Weber, Evangelos Tsoukatos

This book extends our understanding of how different cross-functional business and management disciplines, such as innovation and entrepreneurship, strategic management, marketing and HRM, individually and collectively underpin innovation in business management. Business Models for Strategic Innovation develops insights from cross-disciplinary business knowledge streams and their cutting edge discipline-specific practical implications to create a cross-functional business innovation management model.

ENTREPRENEURIAL UNIVERSITIES
2018 | Edited by João J. FerreiraAlain FayolleVanessa RattenMário Raposo

With an increasing focus on the knowledge and service economies, it is important to understand the role that entrepreneurial universities play through collaboration in policy and, in turn, the impact they have on policy. The authors evaluate how universities engage with communities while also balancing stakeholder considerations, and explore how universities should be managed in the future to integrate into global society effectively.
Accreditation

Comprised of worldwide recognised experts in the field, the Accreditation Council for Engaged and Entrepreneurial Universities (ACEEU) provides the world’s first accreditation programme for entrepreneurship and engagement at institutional level.

INCREASE YOUR RECOGNITION

Give a clear message to your current and future students, business partners, employees and funding bodies that you are an entrepreneurship and/or engagement-oriented institution.

IMPROVE YOUR PERFORMANCE

Use the accreditation procedure’s analysis results and derived recommendations to inform your strategic planning and ultimately to improve your operational performance.

PROMOTE CULTURAL CHANGE

Use the accreditation process to foster cultural change within your organisation, thereby driving the desire of your staff to actively contribute to social and economic impact generation.

JOIN A GLOBAL GROUP OF UNIVERSITIES

The accreditation is currently being piloted by 15 universities around the world.

Interested in becoming one of the next accredited institutions?

www.aceeu.org